

Today's Topics:

ARRL
AUTOMATIC DIGITAL ON HF
Flood alarm frequencies.
Kenwood TM-701 as repeater?
No Code License
Packet compression, what issue?
Packet radio BBS protection (2 msgs)

Date: 29 Dec 89 14:24:16 GMT
From: cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!stjhmc!f1.n234.z1.fidonet.org!Jim.Grubs@tut.cis.ohio-
state.edu (Jim Grubs)
Subject: ARRL
Message-ID: <10226.259B745D@stjhmc.fidonet.org>

* Originally from Brian Battles
* Originally dated 24 Dec 89 14:49:00

In your message, you wrote:

KH> ...Because of Rinaldo's actions, my buck (and my support, and my
KH> respect) has stopped flowing to Newington...

I work at ARRL HQ, but I hope you can accept this as an objective
comment:

As an ARRL member, you have a say in the matter, by means of voting for
(or against) local League officials, writing to the QST editors, etc.
Yes, your voice will be one out of 130,000...but as a non-member, your
influence with the people at ARRL HQ will be...virtually nothing.

73 de Brian Battles WA1YUA
QTH New Britain, Conn.

--
Uucp: ...{gatech,ames,rutgers}!ncar!asuvax!stjhmc!234!1!Jim.Grubs
Internet: Jim.Grubs@f1.n234.z1.fidonet.org

Date: 28 Dec 89 17:52:59 GMT
From: ucsdhub!hp-sdd!hp-pcd!hplsla!hpubvwa!johnh@ucsd.edu (John Hays)
Subject: AUTOMATIC DIGITAL ON HF
Message-ID: <2880002@hpubvwa.NSR.HP.COM>

The new request for rulemaking by the ARRL to allow AUTOMATIC CONTROL of HF Digital Communications is a proposal much needed. HOWEVER, I am concerned that the "CW Good Ol' Boys" have influenced it improperly in one regard; The proposed sub-bands are far too small. 10Khz. on the more popular bands is just inviting an unusable system as demand for HF digital relay requirements increase. I think we should open the entire General/Advanced CW sub-bands to Automatic Digital and Half of the 10M Novice subband (Maybe we require Tech or Above license in the novice subband). If not the full subbands then at least half. This leaves the Extra class segments for CW and attended Digital -- This should leave a good "incentive" for CW users to upgrade to Extra.

Also this same rulemaking should be the place where we change the transmission SPEED rules to BANDWIDTH rules.

Perhaps we create higher bandwidth subbands in some of the Automatic Digital subbands.

Comments? (Send them to the FCC as well)

John D. Hays, KD7UW
KD7UW@KD7UW.UT.USA.NA (AX.25 Packet, NOT INTERNET)
hays@kd7uw.ampr.org [44.40.1.3] AMPRNET
hays@apollo.hp.com INTERNET
hplabs!hpfscse!hpuslua!hays UUCP
72725,424 CI\$
HAYS GENie

Date: 29 Dec 89 05:50:13 GMT
From: pilchuck!ssc!tad@uunet.uu.net (Tad Cook)
Subject: Flood alarm frequencies.
Message-ID: <344@ssc.UUCP>

Speaking of alarm freqs....after the earthquake in California recently I read in the news about a system that was used to warn workers dismantling the collapsed freeway in case of any aftershocks. It was supposed to use radio transmitters along the fault. Anyone know the freq(s) used for this?

73,

Tad Cook
KT7H @ N7HFZ.WA.USA.NA
tad@ssc.UUCP

Date: Fri, 29 Dec 89 09:02:41 PST
From: elmquist@nips.ssesco.com
Subject: Kenwood TM-701 as repeater?
Message-ID: <8912291502.AA02733@nips.ssesco.com>

Does anyone have the newer dual band radio from Kenwood (TM-701)?
It is a relatively small radio (same size and case style as -231
and -431 radios). I'm wondering if it has the 2m<->70cm repeater
capability that the -721 has... I currently have the -221 in
my mobile (cut into the dash...) and the -701 would be a
"drop-in" replacement. I'd like to use it as repeater from my
UHF HT to my favorite 2m simplex freq if at all possible--

73, Chris N0JCF

Date: 29 Dec 89 17:22:01 GMT
From: idacrd!mac@princeton.edu (Robert McGwier)
Subject: No Code License
Message-ID: <547@idacrd.UUCP>

>From article <5806@ncar.ucar.edu>, by cmiller@hao.ucar.edu (Charlie Miller):
>
> I there a restricted Novice license now obtainable without taking
> the code portion of the test? If not, is this in the plans for
> the near future?

Charlie:

AMSAT and TAPR proposed to the ARRL that we institute a no code license. The
ARRL put together a panel of some diversity and studied the issue. They have
sent a proposal for a no code license to the FCC which has not acted on it
yet.

Hopefully soon!

Happy New Year!

Bob

--

My opinions are my own no matter	Robert W. McGwier, N4HY
who I work for! ;-)	CCR, AMSAT, etc.

Date: 29 Dec 89 08:55:29 GMT
From: ka9q.bellcore.com!karn@bellcore.com (Phil Karn)
Subject: Packet compression, what issue?
Message-ID: <18696@bellcore.bellcore.com>

The fundamental problem, IMHO, is that the FCC simply doesn't have the foggiest appreciation of the fact that amateur packet radio is much more than a hi-tech form of RTTY. (This also seems true of the average ham, BTW.)

What does the term "character code" mean when what you're transmitting isn't textual information, but an executable computer program? A digitized image? Digitized speech? It's completely without meaning in those contexts, so don't try to give it one!

The FCC's sad ignorance of what amateur digital communications is all about also shows up in their definition of "data emission" and the HF frequencies on which it can be used. As I read the present (new) rules, the transmission of a digitized picture (e.g., a GIF file) could qualify as EITHER an "Image" transmission or a "Data" transmission. The problem is that, except for 160m, "Image" transmissions are restricted to the "phone" bands while "Data" transmissions are restricted to what are commonly called the "CW" bands (i.e., segments where phone isn't allowed.) So does that mean I can send my GIF files anywhere I want on the 80-10m HF bands? Nowhere?

I have repeatedly tried to pursue these fundamental ambiguities both through my membership on the ARRL Digital Committee (chaired by Paul Rinaldo) and through participation in an ad-hoc committee chaired by Steve Mendelsohn (Hudson Division Director) during the summer of 1988 that was helping prepare the League's response to the rule rewrite docket. In each case I was told that while my concerns were valid, the only truly workable solution (doing away with emission designations altogether and regulating solely on the basis of bandwidth) was considered "too radical" for what was only supposed to be a content-neutral restructuring of the rules. (Actually, if I were to suggest a rule change now, it would be to regulate subband emissions on the basis of "minimum spectral efficiency", not "maximum occupied bandwidth". :-))

I still find it hard to understand the whole point behind the rules rewrite, the stated purpose of which was to "update" the rules and remove ambiguous and outdated language and unnecessary restrictions, when a known problem as fundamental as this one could not be addressed. I've come to the conclusion that the whole exercise was pretty much a complete waste of time. The rules did need comprehensive updating. Sadly, they still do.

Phil

Date: 28 Dec 89 12:17:01 GMT
From: njin!jvnca!njitgw!hertz.njit.edu!ken@rutgers.edu (ken ng cccc)
Subject: Packet radio BBS protection
Message-ID: <948@njitgw.njit.edu>

In article <1682@cstowe.csoft.co.nz> len@cstowe.UUCP (Len) writes:
:I think every Ham is the U.S should send two to three minutes of 'noise',
:just to piss off the N.S.A trying to decode these 'transmissions'. :-)

Ya know, they just *MIGHT* find something in there. :-)

Date: 29 Dec 89 09:58:17 GMT
From: ka9q.bellcore.com!karn@bellcore.com (Phil Karn)
Subject: Packet radio BBS protection
Message-ID: <18697@bellcore.bellcore.com>

>:I think every Ham is the U.S should send two to three minutes of 'noise',
>:just to piss off the N.S.A trying to decode these 'transmissions'. :-)
>
>Ya know, they just *MIGHT* find something in there. :-)

I challenge you to prove that the "squelch burst" you hear at the end of each user's transmission on a given FM voice repeater isn't actually a burst of securely encrypted data. :-)

Seriously, although you *may* be able to prove that a given signal contains information, you can never prove that it doesn't (without knowledge of how it was generated, of course.)

Phil

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #1069
